

**Summary of the Engineering and Operations Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
August 23, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting on August 23, 2002 via videoconference and conference call.

A summary of the discussions, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present an informational summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

Attachment 1 Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2 Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3 Yuba/Feather Work Group Presentation
Attachment 4 Oroville Facilities Relicensing – Engineering and Operations Presentation
Attachment 5 Operations Modeling Update

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting. Several participants from the Yuba/Feather Work Group were in attendance and introduced. The meeting objectives and action items were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Yuba/Feather Work Group-Engineering and Operations Work Group Discussion

Janet Cohen representing South Yuba River Citizens League (SYRCL) provided an overview on the Yuba/Feather Work Group's objectives and activities to date. She explained that the Yuba/Feather Work Group is a stakeholder based process that uses a collaborative approach to examine traditional and non-traditional techniques to enhance flood protection in both the Yuba River and Feather River watersheds. Their approach includes identification of environmental enhancements with consideration of ecological and human demands on river resources and seeks to provide ongoing input into any environmental review processes related to the Yuba and Feather rivers. Janet's presentation is provided as Attachment 3 to this summary.

Rashid Ahmad with DWR provided an overview of the Oroville Facilities Relicensing Program's approach to flood management issues by describing Study Plan E4. His presentation is provided as Attachment 4 to this summary. He briefly explained the history of flood management on the Feather River and explained that SP-E4 would identify and summarize flood studies by various agencies and identify ways to improve flood protection in the Feather River watershed. He described the relationship of flood management issues to the relicensing process and the tasks included in SP-E4 to address the jurisdictional issues associated with flood management.

Curt Aikens asked if FERC would consider recommendations from the Yuba/Feather Work Group. Curtis responded that members of the Yuba/Feather Work Group could participate in the Oroville Facilities relicensing process as a stakeholder and could submit information relevant to issues associated with the Oroville Facilities relicensing process.

Participants discussed modeling efforts and Curtis explained that flood operations modeling would use the existing Corps flood operations manual so those assumptions will not be changed under current scenarios. He suggested that if there were future changes to flood operations on a

comprehensive basis involving other watersheds, DWR would prefer to address those issues separate from relicensing. Brett Whitin, who represents the Army Corps of Engineers on the Yuba/Feather Work Group, added that they have conducted limited technical analyses on operations of Oroville and Bullards Bar due to funding issues. He indicated that when the manual is up for review, the Corps would consider changes suggested by others that make sense but would not necessarily suggest those changes internally. Curtis reminded participants that currently, no operational changes for the Oroville Facilities are proposed for evaluation within the relicensing process.

Curtis suggested that the coordination effort between the two work groups should occur on an informal basis often between Mike Bonner and Curtis. No additional meetings between the Engineering and Operations Work Group and the Yuba/Feather Work Group were scheduled. Mary Keller suggested that since she attends both work groups, she could serve as a liaison between them. Curtis added that a full investigation of the Corps flood operations manual may be needed but should not be undertaken within the relicensing process. He suggested that DWR begin a separate process to explore the need to update the manual with the Corps, and Rashid reminded the participants that DWR is currently drafting a letter to the Corps requesting a review of the Oroville Flood Operations Manual, to be undertaken separate from the relicensing effort.

Curtis thanked the Yuba/Feather Work Group participants for taking the time to attend the Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting and concluded the joint portion of the meeting.

July 26, 2002 Meeting Summary and Action Items

A summary of the July 26, 2002 Engineering and Operations Work Group is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #EO56: Set aside first portion of August Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting as a Task Force meeting with Yuba Feather Work Group to discuss flood management activities by each process.

Status: Participants of the Yuba/Feather Work Group are in attendance for the first portion of the Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting and will discuss their objectives and activities (see summary of presentation below)

Action Item #EO57: Review summaries of Engineering and Operations models to be used during relicensing prepared by Modeling Task Force

Status: Curtis Creel reported that the summaries will be available in September or October and requested this action item be carried over until then.

Carry Over Action Items

Action Item #EO55: Provide summary of watershed modeling issues for Work Group, with input from Work Group participants.

Status: As requested by Butte County, this Action Item will be carried over until December 2002.

Action Item #EO49: Discuss Fluvial 12 modeling with appropriate DWR and consulting team members to determine data needs.

Status: Curtis reminded the participants that this topic is to be discussed at a joint Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force meeting that has not been scheduled. He reported that Ken Kules, representing MWD and Koll Buer, Steve Ford and Curtis Creel representing DWR have agreed to meet next week to discuss Ken's concerns off-line so that the joint meeting discussion can be more focused. The Joint Task Force meeting date will be set after that discussion.

Frank Caunt of the Butte County Water Commission asked if Curtis and his team were planning to talk to the operators of the Oroville Facilities to get their perspectives regarding project operations

during model development. Curtis responded that those conversations were planned and would occur during model calibration and simulation.

Operations Modeling Update

Curtis provided participants with a document summarizing the status of operations modeling efforts (Attachment 5). He explained the current schedule for model development and indicated that development of the Feather River temperature and Thermalito temperature models are considered priority tasks. He added that the Feather River temperature model will extend to the confluence with the Sacramento River and assumptions regarding other inputs such as the Yuba River temperature contribution still need to be determined. Curtis reported that earlier problems with obtaining calibration information for RMA 10, the UC Davis model, have been solved. He said that the Environmental Work Group was not too concerned with the delay because the model was not likely to be needed until the second year of studies. Curtis also reported that a separate model to determine stage/flow information may not be needed because the temperature models have a hydrodynamic component that might provide stage/flow information.

Curtis suggested that the tabletop exercise conducted earlier this year was very helpful in explaining the approach to modeling runs to those who attended, and he suggested the exercise be provided for a future Engineering & Operations Task Force meeting. Engineering and Operations Work Group participants agreed a hypothetical exercise to walk through the model runs and postulate several 'what if?' scenarios would be helpful.

Update on Plenary Activities

The Facilitator updated the participants on Plenary Group actions taken during their recent conference call meeting that centered around assessing heartburn issues on Study Plan F9, Hatchery Impacts. NMFS did indicate some heartburn on technical issues, and the Plenary Group referred SP-F9 to the Environmental Work Group for resolution of the heartburn issues. The Plenary Group conditionally approved SP-F9 pending resolution of NMFS' issues and approval of the study plan by the Environmental Work Group. Participants at the Plenary Group meeting also expressed some concern over the model development schedule and questioned if the models would be ready to effectively serve the relicensing process during development of potential protection, mitigation and enhancement measures. Curtis suggested he could provide the Plenary Group with an update of model development at the next Plenary Group meeting.

Update on Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force

The Joint Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force meeting date will be set after Ken Kules, Koll Buer, Steve Ford and Curtis Creel meet next week to focus the issues Ken has raised.

Next Steps

The Engineering and Operations Work Group agreed their next meeting would be:

Date: September 27, 2002

Time: 10:30am – 12:30pm

Location: Videoconference between Oroville Field Division, Oroville and Joint Operations Center, Sacramento with a conference call-in number available.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Engineering and Operations Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action and due date.

No action items developed as a result of the meeting.

Carry Over Action Items

Action Item #EO57: Review summaries of Engineering and Operations models prepared by Modeling Task Force

Responsible: Engineering and Operations Work Group participants

Due Date: Summaries expected to be available in September or October.

Action Item EO#55 Provide summary of watershed modeling issues for Work Group, with input from Work Group participants

Responsible: DWR

Due Date: December 2002

Action Item EO#49 Discuss Fluvial 12 modeling with appropriate DWR and consulting team members to determine data needs.

Responsible: Joint Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force

Due Date: After next Joint Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force meeting